Subject: Chat with Scott Mintz
From: Scott Mintz <scott.w.mintz@gmail.com>
To: barriticus@gmail.com

Scott: barrett, quick 2 questions. do you know if Tim held his meeting today? also, did you get the email I sent on Fri?
me: I had to leave for a while today, let me look and see about the e-mail
Scott: thanks
me: what e-mail is it again?
Scott: i sent it friday, subject was wrap up
me: yes
me: got that
Scott: ok good
Scott: know if the meeting was held today?
me: everyone keeps sending me e-mails with subject lines or first lines that sound like they're going to quit or something and it keeps freaking me out because I'm always stoned
me: no idea
me: yours was "wrap-up," Campbell's was "bad news"
me: some others I forgot
me: and then it's some minor thing
me: but yeah, wasn't around for meeting and not sure if it happened
Scott: yea, i'd try to get whatever flavor they're selling that's supposed to instill calmness :)
Scott: alright ill shoot tim an email and ask
me: anyway, like I said the other day, the event in April and run-up campaign is going to be the main thing I'll be working on
me: as there's potential here to really utilize this opportunity
me: we could get hundreds of good recruits through this
Scott: that sounds fantastic
Scott: if it's okay with you, i'd like to not get as involved with it until i feel more comfortable
Scott: i'm not educated enough on the subject to know where i stand
me: ok
Scott: if you have time to talk about it, i'd certainly be up for a discussion
me: soitanly
me: also
me: do you think you can try to get in touch with this lady for us?
me: Lisa Mumbach
me: she wrote this article
me: http://www.iftf.org/node/3676
Scott: Lisa looks a lot like a man.
Scott: nvm
me: yeah, seems to be very unsettling editorial error

Scott: lol yes
Scott: yea I'm sure I can hunt down her email address and send her an appropriate message
Scott: is there a primary goal?
Scott: just got get her onboard? to get her involved in covering the rally? etc
Scott: with regards to wikileaks rally/anonymous here's some of the things I'm interested in learning more about.
Scott: I certainly agree that transparency needs to be increased.
me: just to get her involved in general
me: I want to talk to her about her article
Scott: I do believe Wikileaks will bet a net positive, but to think there isn't potential for at least a single negative is presumptive IMHO, whether it to be an individual or more.
me: oh, also
me: Emma is really mad at me right now
Scott: yea, her institute looks interesting
me: due to Nikki here
me: And Nikki will now be in charge of running my life
me: because I need girls to do that for me unfortunatelt
Scott: you should go to polyamory counseling
Scott: jk
me: her e-mail address is on those articles I forwarded
me: tell me about it
me: she's half Asian so really competent
Scott: and no worries, i agree, i generally prefer a woman to organize my life for me
me: yeah, it just works better that way
Scott: skipping formalities, does this mean we cannot rely on emma?
me: not sure yet
me: will let you know
me: keeps changing
Scott: got it
Scott: ok,well I'm not sure I can tomorrow, but I'll send out an email to Lisa ASAP.
Scott: Anyway we can get to Wiki/Anon as I think a discussion would lead to better understanding which will enable me to hopefully be more supportive.
me: I hope so
me: I think I can convince you
Scott: It certainly would be an interesting exercise.
Scott: ok so I have little problems with increases in transparency.
Scott: my problem arises in the theory behind certain persons that releasing information is a no risk proposition, however, this is only an assumption on my part
Scott: I don't know where you draw the line btwn invasion of privacy and uncovering suspect actions
me: when the information stems from the actions of those who operate with the alleged consent of a population that is forced to support it with a portion of their wealth and are

subject to the laws that are created under its auspices.
Scott: slow down
Scott: i have to read that 3 times
Scott: ok so we're saying that the government has zero right to privacy (and i presume we agree that business privacy and personal privacy are two separate things?)
me: I don't see from where it would obtain such a right
me: I actually have no idea from where the rights of governments derive
me: I suspect they derive from nowhere
me: and are fictionalized into existence for convenience
Scott: i know the coverage has been inexplicably broadened, but where has national security provisions come from?
me: I don't understand the question
Scott: also, and I recognize this isn't the mandate of voted representatives, but if a group within a repressive country is asking for assistance in order to overthrow their Gov't is that something we have a right to get involved in? if so, does secrecy come into play?
me: it would if our government had a record of doing so properly
Scott: i was wondering when the usage of we cannot share yada yada in the interest of national security came into play, if you knew
me: or if it did so on a basis of justice rather than an expediency that allows for the deaths of hundreds of thousands
me: existing does not grant a government any rights
me: it is not a person
Scott: good point
me: it is the manifestation of the will of some number of persons
me: I don't trust those persons enough to allow them a monopoly on power
Scott: so far we're good
Scott: basically rights are only given to individuals
Scott: therefore government has no rights, including that of privacy
me: no
me: not because of that
me: the government would be granted those "rights" by people such as myself if they acted in anything close to accordance of what I and others know that governments can proceed as
me: but to the extent that one looks, one finds all manner of acts conducted by these governments that violate not only the demonstrable rights of individuals, but also their own laws
me: And so
me: I would ask you a question
me: What does a government have to do before you consider it to be a criminal entity rather than a legitimate one?
Scott: anything illegal
Scott: but using the same framing, I'm a criminal as I've done illegal things.
me: more importantly, that framing would lead to you already considering the government

we're under to be a criminal entity
Scott: correct
me: in which case
me: you might be inclined to refrain from providing loyalty to that government
me: and, insomuch as that the rule of law is not being uniformly enforced
me: you might seek to either work to establish the rule of law
me: or work in accordance with whatever you'd like to see come about to address such a situaton
me: or both
Scott: right
Scott: while the latter may be insufficient versus the former
me: probably
Scott: I'm not ready or righteous enough to take in the first task to form my own establishment, especially as I'd be a victim of my own laws unless I decided that a lot of things are legal which are currently illegal.
Scott: which is certainly a possibility.
me: that's fine
me: as we're not doing that quite yet
me: and it won't be involved with Project PM in any explicit fashion
Scott: I'm not concerned with that.
Scott: I'm just trying to better grasp it.
me: you don't agree with the approach?
Scott: I have no problem taking the approach of thetruth.com in terms of raising awareness.
Scott: Now, to my knowledge, no one was been assassinated, etc, as a result of the cables release.
Scott: So I continue to believe the ends justify the means as it's a net benefit, but I'd be concerned that we'd establish that everything must be 100% transparency and/or people will take it to the extreme of infringing on personal rights. Clearly, this is not an immediate concern.
Scott: Then comes the pro-Wikileaks support.
Scott: Initially I passionately disagreed with denial of service attacks, but the analogy, to which I think you either wrote or pointed to, that resonated with me that this is modern day civil disobedience as back in the day protests were used to disrupt the ordinary course of business and essentially that's what these approaches are doing.
Scott: However, the legal framework hasn't quite kept up-to-date on the times so such actions are illegal.
me: they were illegal then, too, Scott
Scott: But to the extreme, this does bring up a major potential for abuses of power but those seeking to prevent such abuses.
Scott: I did not know that.
me: And they were returned with firehoses and dogs and official oppression
Scott: Those are good points.

Scott: I guess to get down the nitty gritty, what's stopping someone who gets fired from a job to tell a bunch of people to attack?
me: nothing that we can implement
me: that's not our responsibility
me: as it's out of our control and not of our causing
me: we're doing something for a very good reason
Scott: Or what happens when the lines become a little more blurry and the subject is a lot more grey.
me: we didn't invent the current environment and we don't advocate everything that occurs in that environment
Scott: Is there a particular code of conduct?
Scott: please note I'm siimly asking questions to learn.
me: I know, I had to piss, I'm drinking beer
me: we don't have a code ourselves but we're pretty honest and well-meaning people
me: again, it's not our job to determine what happens with the internet and we can't decide that anyway
Scott: I do think that raises a question.
me: we're doing ethical and reasonable things in advancement of several good causes
Scott: Should there be a sense of responsibility?
Scott: Not for yourselves, per say, but for the environment which is existing.
me: yes
me: of course they should
me: I'm telling you that we're doing things a certain way
me: and almost all of us support what Wikileaks has done
me: and we expect that more of it will be done
me: and we want to help ensure that it is done right
Scott: I certainly think those are admirable goals, and concur that more this will continue. Furthermore, as I said earlier, I believe it's a net positive.
Scott: I guess I'll sum up my concerns by saying that I'd be frightful that while far from the case currently and in the future, a witch hunt is plausible.
Scott: I very much look forward to seeing how thing unravel.
me: me too
me: just hang with us, yo
me: seriously, I need your help with all of this, so we'll talk again about these issues
Scott: I'd like that.
me: word, I'm going to play Victoria 2 as Ireland